

But there is a man praying against him!

He would not like to be rich. He is so much in earnest that he prays about the matter. People would stare at the offering of such a prayer now-a-days. Was the man sane when he offered it?

1. He gave a reason for his prayer. Insane men do not reason much. Hear the reason. "Let I be full and deny thee, and say who is the Lord." Hence he would not be rich. Now if riches cause men to deny and disregard God—if they magnify temporal things so as to eclipse eternal—if they become a god in the place of the only living God, then there was a reason for the strange prayer, and we think he must have been sane that could give so good a reason for his conduct.

2. If riches are often dangerous, then there is more proof that this praying man was not insane. Abab wanted more riches, and his wicked wife helped him intrude his hands in innocent blood to obtain them, and they both perished miserably. Judas wanted more money—betrayed Christ to get it, and it cost him his life. Annanias and Sapphira wanted wealth, and lied to the Holy Ghost about a sum of money, and they both perished. This looks as though there was danger about riches. And it does not prove a man insane to think so. And it is as proper to pray for escape from this danger as any other.

3. The praying man agreed exactly in opinion with some of the ancient and best persons ever on earth, which insane men are apt to do. Jesus Christ said, "how hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" affirming also, that "deceitfulness of riches choke the word." We add, he must have had gold dust in his eyes, or dust of some kind, in it reading the history of the world, he has not perceived there was danger to men's spiritual welfare from the possession of riches. For a good man to pray for safety against such danger, is not so great a mistake. We have looked sharply, but we do not perceive any insanity in it. Men do not pray much in this generation against being rich. They are so satisfied that they can guide the whirlwind and control the storm of temptation, that they are not afraid of wealth. They acknowledge the vast increase of allurement to evil by it, and the vast increase of perplexity and care, but then the accumulation of power, and honor, and perhaps of pleasure carries the day.

And then, so much good can be done by riches; this spreads a deceitful splendor over wealth, so that even the saints are beguiled. They would spend every energy to gain property, so that they may do good with it. And they will let spiritual riches tinkle into their coffers by the penny only, and these pence far between each other; while this world's wealth rolls in upon them like a river. "We will do good with it!" "Aye," says Satan "arrive for it, pant after it, peril everything for it; get it, only get it, for that reason or any reason, and I will take care it shall be a millstone about your neck." So thousands of the saints have found it. And for that reason God in kindness keeps most of his people from being rich. Some of them do not feel very well about it. But they will be wiser before the elements melt with fervent heat. And when they are, they will not think the prayer of Agur a strange prayer.—*Boston Recorder.*

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, JAN. 13, 1841.

Cash Wanted.

I want \$500, between this time and the middle of January. Shall I have it where it is due?

FURTHER ADMONITION.

The following article will explain itself. Read it through. It is lengthy, but it will pay for the labor of perusal.—*N. Y.*

The Luke George (N. Y.) Bapt. Ass., To the Hephzibah Baptist Association, Gt. Britain:—

It appears that the Minutes for 1838, of the Luke George Baptist Association, N. Y., have been before you. After having them examine, you adopted the following resolution, respecting them:

"Resolved, That in relation to a Minute directed to this Body, from the Luke George Association, (New York) containing a resolution, most false, unchristian, unchristian, insinuating and dangerous in its nature, and utterly unworthy of the notice of this or any Christian Body. Your Committee recommended that said Minute be returned to the Body from whence it emanated, with the following endorsement (officially signed) viz: Beneath the notice of this or any Christian Body."

This with the Minutes you sent our Corresponding Secretary, on receiving them, he sent you a copy of our Minutes for 1839, which was returned bearing the following statement:

"No number in future will be taken out of the office, much less insult the Association with its trashy contents."

The whole thing laid before us at our last anniversary, we felt it our duty to address you on the resolution you have censured. It reads thus:

"Resolved, That in the opinion of this Body, every feature of American Slavery is wholly opposed to the law of God; and that we labor for its immediate removal from the church and the world."

You say, brethren, that this resolution is "most false." But we say it is not, and so here we are at issue. It contains the positive truth that, in our opinion, American Slavery is, what we say it is.—We did not print and publish an "opinion" that was not then ours. There was no dis-

simulation in doing so. It also contains the truth that we then resolved to "labor for its removal from the church and the world;" and we have hitherto acted accordingly.

Your catalogue of charges against it is closed by the statement that it is "dangerous in sentiment," and we will not deny it. It certainly is "dangerous,"—but to what? That to which the deep moving power, of the heaven-born genius of liberty has ever been dangerous, viz: ABSOLUTE DESPOTISM—precisely its very opposite. To this, and to this alone, the "sentiment" is "dangerous." Feeling this to be another truth of the resolution, we are more determined than ever to act on it. Nor do we mean that the action will terminate, only with our probationary being.

Do not imagine, brethren, that there is obstinacy here; or anything opposed to a simple, ever stirring consciousness of duty. To prove faithful to the sentiments of "The Declaration of Independence,"—to act on the principles of the religion of Jesus,—to exhibit the noble spirit that has ever made fearless foes, to every kind of despotism, of our beloved denomination; and, above all, to avoid proving traitors and double-minded recreants to the sacred professions brought on us by our sacramental covenants with a sin-opposing God, we must thus act. In this we oppose not the master of the slave, nor any of his real interests. We solemnly pledge ourselves to oppose only the slave-system; but if individuals identify themselves with this, we can not help it. Nor let it be thought that we shall use the firebrands of pro-slavery incendiaries, or wield the weapons of slander and abuse. Neither shall we appeal to feeble sympathy, much less to our hallowed passions in our moral and intellectual warfare. God's and nature's spirit-stirring truth is the machinery we shall employ.

We might justly stand on the offensive, until some efforts, at least, were made to substantiate your charges against our resolution; but as it is not our object to tantalize individuals, or to hold a controversy with you, barely for the sake of conquering, we shall attempt to prove that our tradduced "opinion" is correct. Before we enter on this we must notice some of the laws.—The laws of one State tell us that, "Slaves shall be deemed, held, taken, reputed, and adjudged in law to be chattels personal in the hands of their owners and possessors, and executors, administrators, and assigns, TO ALL INTENTS, CONSTRUCTIONS, AND PURPOSES WHATSOEVER." The law of another State speaks thus, "A slave is one who is in the power of his master, to whom he belongs; the master may sell him, dispose of his person, his industry, and his labors; he can do nothing, possess nothing nor acquire anything but what must belong to his master." Here we have the statutes that give features, form, and being itself to American Slavery. To us they appear the strangest and most surprising laws that have ever been found in heaven, earth, or hell.

It is true they do not require that the slave should be gagged, flogged, dogged, thumb-screwed, or in any manner maltreated. And we are willing to step aside, for a moment, on the supposition that he is not. We feel decidedly indisposed to believe that the slave of the pious man especially is ever hunted by the blood-hound, or lashed by the task-master. Let us grant that he is, on the contrary, well supported, and treated with kindness; for a man may be kind to his beast. Nay, we will help you, even by supposing perfect impossibilities, to make his condition, and the conduct of his master towards him, as good as you please; still, if the antagonist of slavery had no other objects in view but to brand the slaveholding communities with eternal disgrace; to fix a burning reproach on their extravagant legislators; to set an ever-withering stigma on their profession of religion, were it composed even of Brahminical abominations; and to accumulate the universal contempt and derision of Aristocrats and tyrants on republican governments, it would be only necessary for them, in order to accomplish their ends, to perpetuate the exhibition of those laws to the world.

Why then are persons exasperated at the language of abolitionists? It is utterly impossible for them to pour a greater measure of reproach on the slave-holder, than his own laws are calculated to roll upon him.—Formidably execrable as they may appear to some, abolitionists have neither talents nor dispositions; nor could they find among all the movements of intellectual might, energy sufficient to render the creature of those laws more abhorrent and infamous, than the very laws themselves do. Brethren you may call it your peculiar, domestic, patriarchal institution, or just what you please; but its own laws invest it with the most detestable ignominy, and prominently hang it out to universal execration. They attach to it all the direful peculiarities of infamy. They have made it capable of centering in itself everything that is flagitious. It is a babel of unrighteousness, based on the violated laws of the Creator, composed of inalienable immunities broken into fragments, and cemented together by a moral magnetism that can draw to itself everything perfectly abominable. This is how we view it, nor can we view it other-

wise; its own laws will not suffer us. We see it as a black pedestal of guilt, reared by those laws, between the poor slave and his owner, flinging from it the dark shade of its demoralizing influence, possessing the fearful capability of unhumanizing humanity on each side of it. O, good God! how deplorable must that moral apostasy be which has produced such laws, and built such a monument of turpitude, and that too under the brilliant beams of a righteous revelation! Even a momentary thought of them bears with it a thrill of horror, as it passes from one avenue to another, in its flight through the soul. It is enough to congeal all the feelings and sensibilities of the mind. Do they not completely strip man of his manhood? Do they not maim him, and turn him into a thing? O yes!

And to this heart-withering doom, any person, either white or black, a Sir Isaac Newton as well as Bob the negro, is liable according to those laws; for they pay no attention to the notion that thick lips, curled hair, long heels, and a black skin are situated in the scale of existence somewhere between the white man and the orange-outang, and therefore doomed by the fast bolting power of fate, to interminable vassalage. They do not say, "A slave is a negro or black man;" but, "A slave is one who is in the power of his master." Now if those laws happened to be like the Medo-Persian statutes, in some of the world shaking revolutions of human wickedness, the black man might chance to get the whip hand of the white, and lash him on under the yoke. But it may be that your legislators, when framing those laws, had their eyes on the renowned prodigies of martial skill and valor, with the illustrious christian luminaries, that poor Africa has given to the world; or perhaps they then thought of the "bleached," thin-lipped, and straight-haired productions of that pro-slavery scare-crow, which has been so valiantly used, not only as an execrating tool, but as a blood-shedding, martyr-making weapon against "the infatuated abolitionists." If so, there is sufficient reason for their not designating the unadulterated negro as the exclusive victim of those laws. This would never do for them, and be at the very time perhaps, attended in the legislative hall, by "half-cast" slaves. But we say that those laws and their singular creature are opposed to the laws of God. And now for the proof.

1. "Thou shalt not steal," is one of the laws of God. Thou shalt not take from another, by any means whatever, that which belongs to him, without his consent, or the approbation of divine justice. This we think is the import of the commandment. Now man possesses a certain natural, original, intrinsic, "inalienable" right, and that is a right to himself. This is an undeniable, positive, "self-evident" truth. It is so plain and palpable that not even the slave-holder will think of defending it for himself; because he knows that no man of common sense will ever dispute it. Well, if this is the right of any one, it must be the right of every one of ALL the nations of men that God has made of one blood. Now if the slave-holder will not deny this—as he can not—he is bound at once to "let the oppressed go free;" but if he denies it, he denies his right to himself, and daily contradicts the Declaration of Independence, and thus proves himself an enemy to the Republic. He may choose what horn he pleases of this tri-lemma, with which, constitutionally, to gore; and, religiously, to kill, his slave system. This indisputable right is taken by his holder from the slave, and consequently the holder is guilty of a breach of the eighth commandment. I will never do to have recourse to the crippled notion that as persons are born into slavery, others have a right to them, and not themselves. He who does this faces the Declaration of Independence sword in hand. He binds himself to prove that God entered a proviso in the constitution of human rights, by which some of our race could perpetually enslave others, without revealing what class, or caste, or color they should be. And supposing he could succeed in proving this, it would be after getting into the centre of an inexplicable labyrinth, for he would have yet to prove, without any possibility of proving it, that whites had the right of mastery, before it could be of any use to him. Every human being having an original right to himself, the condition or circumstances of his birth, can no more take it from the child of the slave, than it can from the child of the owner; and consequently he who takes it from him, violates the commandment. He takes that which is not his. But on this natural right hangs every other right of man. It is the grand and common centre of the whole. It is the first link of that golden chain, which God himself has made. He who breaks a single link of this chain, sets his devoted head under the descending electricity of infinite displeasure. Well, the slave-law-makers of America, with the first link, taken the whole chain and dashed it into atoms.

When the slave eats, drinks, sleeps, and works, it is not for himself; it is not for anything he has ever had, or expects to have; but simply and solely for his master. He is not his own, much less is the produce of his toil, or the fruits of his ingenuity his own. He speaks figuratively when he says, *my hands, my feet, my eyes, my head, my body, myself.* What pleasure a wealthy slave-holding farmer may have, from year to year, in seeing his young broods of horses, sheep, cattle, swine and slaves. They are all his property, the man as well as the horse; the woman as well as the cow; the boy as well as the pig; the girl as well as the lamb. He rears and raises the whole for the market. He feeds his slaves well, for the same reason that he does his swine. For he knows that no one would be fool enough to give as much for any kind of live stock when they are poor, as he would if they were in good order. He need not brag then of his kindness to the slave. It is his interest to keep him well, and who would thank him for it. Now this is the best feature of American Slavery. We do not vilify it. It is complete, absolute, involuntary servitude. It is the lowest state of debasing, degrading, brutalizing vassalage into which a rational being can be sunk. With one fell swoop, then it seizes man's rights and immunities and tears them all away from him; and here we have manifold violations of the holy commandment. It is impossible to disprove this. If man has any such thing as an original right, he must have received it from his Creator.—His Creator only then, or some agent or agency authorized by Him in His revealed will, can justly take it from him. Well, there is not a slave-holder in America who can give even the shadow of a proof that he is such an agent, or that he has such an agency over his slaves; and consequently it is infinitely beyond the power of any slave-holder in America to disprove that he deliberately, systematically, and perpetually violates the commandment.

Let us suppose that A. meets B. at the midnight hour and takes a sum of money from him by force. Here is a breach of the eighth commandment. Well, A. meets his victim again, and compels him to work a year for him, giving him nothing but food and raiment, and just such as he pleases, for his labor. The produce of poor B.'s toil, is as good to A. as the money of which he robbed him. Now is not the latter affair as much a breach of the commandment as the former? Certainly. Well this is American Slavery. A hundred fold robbery was committed in the case of each creature of the soil of America. Parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, were robbed by kidnappers, of children and parents, wives and husbands, sisters and brothers; and in this, of course, the ill-fated beings themselves were robbed of rights given them by their Creator, interwoven in the complex constitution of their moral, physical, and intellectual nature. If this was not plunder of the first degree—the most atrocious order—then Alexander, Caesar, Tamarlane, and Napoleon, were harmless, inoffensive men. Those creatures were dragged by the allied forces of violence, villainy, felony, and fraud, controlled and directed by supreme cupidity, from the wiles and retreats from which they were routed by the terror-striking approach of slave-ships and men-stealers. Crimeless and innocent, in chains and manacles, they were then stuffed and stowed, crammed and crowded into a filthy floating sty—the fittest emblem of hell that earth could afford—where they were abused for their misfortune, trampled on for their misery, and flogged for their wretchedness. Then starving and pining, groaning and languishing, dying and living, grief-worn and broken-hearted, they had to pass through a long and lingering voyage, something like half an eternity of woe, and at length reached the land of their everlasting bondage, and there was the origin of your "Patriarchal Institution!"—*Patriarchal Institution!!!* What ferocious and reason-daring foolery it is to give such an enormous abomination that venerable title! For the sake of common sense let the world hear no more of it. With inconceivably greater propriety might the Pharisees be called "saints," instead of "whited sepulchres," than this deep, dark, and dismal, this lonesome, large, and loathsome tomb of human rights and prerogatives, a "Patriarchal Institution." Those who hold the first slaves who landed in the country, had no just right to them before or after the purchase, any more than the kidnappers. In buying them then, they made themselves sharers of the blood and criminality of the kidnappers. But if this was the case, what has it to do with modern slave-holders? Just as much as his posterity has to do with the sin of Adam.—They endorse it; and consequently break the commandments. In short, it is impossible for the slave-holder to clear himself of a breach of this commandment in the iniquitous intricacies of his complicated system. As well might the tortured human heart, in Pollok's poetic hell, get clear of all the doublings and foldings of "the worm that never dies."

2. The law of reciprocity is another of the laws of God. Now does the slave-holder give to his servant "that which is just and equal?" Does he do to the slave what he would the slave should do to him, were their circumstances altered? If so, why does he force from him his unrequited labor? Why does he keep him in interminable vassalage? Does the master love

the slave as he does himself? If he does, why does he give him—yes, him who is perhaps, an heir of glory—a separate table to eat at, and an inferior seat in the house of God? But where shall we end our interrogations? There is not a slave-holder in the world who does not transgress this law every moment of his life.

3. God, as an intelligent and moral Being, is governed by laws of His own—or laws peculiar to himself—in all His operations. Acting according to those laws, to accomplish His own purposes, He has made man a moral agent. But the American slave-laws incapacitate him for moral agency. We need not rummage all the stores of logic and literature to prove this. No being can be a moral, without being a free agent; and no being can be a free agent, without having a will of his own. And supposing the Creator had given him that faculty originally, if it is absolutely subjected to the will of another, it is just as if he never possessed it. He is a mere machine, acted on by foreign influence,—a living frame-work, kept in motion by the will of another. Who would think of calling a thing, either living or inanimate, a moral agent; and why should a being who is converted into a thing, be considered one? Well, this is the predicament of every slave in America. It matters not that the Creator has made them free moral agents, as far as your laws extend,—and that is as far as human beings can stretch any laws,—they are stripped of their moral agency, and consequently so far uncreated. Perhaps you have never dreamed that your legislators are anti-creators, but they are, as much as Geo. Thompson is an anti-slavery man. But notice still closer. Some of the lineaments of God's image in man belong to those powers which constitute him a moral agent; and if his moral agency is stricken off, those lineaments are blotted out, the divine image is mutilated, and his moral nature so far decomposed. Some may say that men can not frustrate the purposes of the Almighty; but let such persons look at the slave-holders of America. Again,

4. God acted according to His own peculiar laws when He gave man—not a man, or any number of men—but MAN—the race of man without exception, "dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over everything that creepeth upon the earth." If the slave-holder denies that this dominion involves a subordinate right of ownership in those things, he will only destroy his own avowed right to any of them, and cut the throat of his pretended right of ownership or property in his fellow beings. He may choose which of these brands he pleases to fix on himself the burning mark of reprobation with; as a frustrator of divine purposes. And now what are we to think of the divinely authorized and constituted lord and owner of these creatures, being himself sunk to their level, degraded to the brutal inferiority of their condition, and driven hither and thither, as they are, and with them? What are we to think of the sceptre of control being wrenched from his grasp, the crown of royalty dashed from his brow, and his whole nature, immortal and all, turned into an article of commerce, a chattel, a piece of goods? It is no surprise that such a creature is denied trial by jury. For what a curious thing it would be to see a judge and jury solemnly sit to try an ox! In this the slave-holder is consistent. Why should he try a thing? Your slave-law-makers ought to go to school, and learn to say that "a slave is a thing, and not a slave is one."

But look at this wonderful frustration of divine designs! this astonishing usurpation of infinite rights and authority! The simple fact is, that the tremendous magnitude of the guilt involved in this, has nearly acquired the power of annihilating in one's mind the indignation it merits, and of leaving nothing in view of it but unutterable wonder, something like an awful precipice, that necessarily dashes into pieces, whatever may drop from its summit. Can you imagine that God designed, when He gave dominion to man over the brute creation, that any of his progeny should fabricate an institution by which others could possess nothing, nor acquire anything? Can you think that He entered a provision in that arrangement by which Americans are authorized to convert their fellow creatures into two footed cattle,—to use intelligent, imperishable spirits, as merchandise,—to sell them, swap them, mortgage them, trade them away for the brutes that perish, for articles of food, clothing, and furniture;—or to stake them as wagers at the card-table, the cock-pit, and the race-stand, according to their wishes, whims, and fancies? Can any being, however reckless, on this side of hell, possess the terrible hardihood to draw upon his soul such a mass of impurity as to say that a God of infinite goodness and rectitude has done so? Can it be possible that there is a blood-bought follower of the immortal, who will say so? If not, then we solemnly ask why are persons thus treated, or rendered liable to such treatment? Where is the divine authority for doing it? We implore high heaven, we inquire of a doleful hell, we ask the wide world, and we request all nature—reason—conscience—and common sense to tell us

where? But O! one great echo from the whole, and only answers—where?—in a philanthropic, arouse from their slumber. Here, then, we have "every feature of American Slavery, wholly opposed to the law of God," and not only so, but opposed to His decrees, designs, and purposes, the production, order, and government of the creation. For whosoever shall break whole law, and yet offend in one point is guilty of all." This brings us to the slave-holder, and solemnly charges him. We would a thousand times rather be in the condition of his slaves than of him.

But, brethren, it seems that our ears are beneath your notice. This is done by your opinion of ourselves, also. We are a poor, plain people, therefore, scarce among some of the granite crags of "Empire State." We gather our fare among those interesting irregularities of nature's productions, by the loss of sweat and the labor of our hands. We sorry it is so. This is one way of venting the deplorable depravity of our nature, from getting support for our unrequited toil. We humbly thank therefore, for this lot in the arrangements of His providence. Though we have our axes, roll our logs, and raise our by our own hard toil, we have more to be in doing so, than in having it done rational "chattels personal," without which is just and equal." This being condition, none of us have splendid mansions to occupy, and some live in log huts. Nor are we ashamed of this, and we the fact that an individual has been transferred by the suffrage of a migration, from a "LOG CABIN" to one of the highest seats on the globe, would be to take away the blush. But if this circumstance had never transpired, the pretence that a certain glorious Being, his nativity in a still more humble place, certainly is sufficient to do it.

And we have pleasure in reflecting though we and our religious operations despised by our fellow worms of the dust, a blessed Being does notice us when we pray to Him, and when calling in His name and strength, to stem the rents of iniquity that roll over our heads.

He is "the high and lofty one," but He has condescended to become our mighty Friend and elder Brother, and to be in our midst when we meet together in His name. Were we despised by Him, we should not be surprised; but think the epoch a strange one in the history of a denomination that has ever been despised for its adherence to the truth, and finds some of its members despised brethren for righteousness sake.

Do not imagine that we wish under lash of your contempt, though it be the lash of the slave-driver. The fact that we come under it would be enough to extract all the venom of the misery we could give from it. Were it so, it can not move us, than the picking of a wren from the Rocky Mountains from their nest.

And why should it, when we find the ter spirits of the age on our side, and course, exposed to it? We think ours in good company with Scotch, Irish, British, as well as American abolitionists. The strongest talents under heaven, and in the invulnerable armor of moral, religious, and political truth, are in the slavery ranks. The best built spirits of our own denomination are with us. The Irish Baptist Union, long since opened battery on your "peculiar institution," the wide-spread Atlantic is not a rap long for their sacred artillery. It is no Cooes', the Bolles', the Waylands', Welches', and others of our brethren not with us. Nor can you say that we are entirely yours. Their principles not with you. You have their inconsistency, but see how it is treated in England. It takes a single-minded man to be a abolitionist in the United States.

But it seems, after all, that you have some notice of our Minutes, and felt a noble unpleasant in view of their "trashy contents." They are beneath your notice, yet you have noticed them. Their contents are trashy; and if so, they must be pabls of effecting anything, they can hurt your institution; still they are something "most false, unchristian, christian, insulting, and dangerous in its ment." How will you reconcile these extravagant contradictions?

But to close. Brethren do not think a moment, that we cherish any ill-will towards you. You have never injured us. From the centre of our souls we pray the horrid curse of slavery may be from you. We solemnly believe it is such; but still we may be mistaken some things. Our belief does not make infallible. If we are wrong, then we earnestly and affectionately request information on the subject. We devoutly place ourselves to be open to conviction. So, then, your light, your animadversions, what you please, besides naked assent. They will not do. Why do you not respond with abolitionists, and discuss the subject? It looks rather dark and suspicious in slave-holders not to do this.

In behalf of the Association,
JAMES DELANY, Committee
Ticonderoga, N. Y., Jan. 5, 1841.